

Date: Sun, 13 Mar 94 04:30:22 PST
From: Ham-Equip Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-equip@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Equip-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Equip Digest V94 #62
To: Ham-Equip

Ham-Equip Digest Sun, 13 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 62

Today's Topics:

 Best cars for mobile HF/VHF??
 Diesel or Taurus fr HF/VHF mobile??
 Need mobile tribander advice.
 Wanted: "This Week in Amateur Radio" Info
 Wanted: Info on programming Wilson WH6016B
 WANTED Technics 1200

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Equip-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Equip Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-equip".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Mar 1994 15:36:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!
haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!adam@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Best cars for mobile HF/VHF??
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar11.135613.16379@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
>Look at what the cops are driving.

Good idea, Gary. Just don't forget to leave off the whitewalls!

-N3NKI

Date: 11 Mar 1994 19:29:39 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!news.udel.edu!
brahms.udel.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Diesel or Taurus fr HF/VHF mobile??
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I got a variety of responses for a car which would be good for 100 watts or so of HF and 50 or so of 2 meter and 440 radio. Criteria were lack of interference from car into receiver and from transmitter into auto electronics.

Diesels and the Taurus were among those favored. Anyone else have comments on these choices.

Tnx agn Bob

--

Bob Penneys, WN3K Frankford Radio Club Internet: penneys@pecan.cns.udel.edu
Work: Ham Radio Outlet (Delaware) (800) 644-4476; fax (302) 322-8808
Mail at home: 12 East Mill Station Drive Newark, DE 19711 USA

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 1994 22:40:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!pitstop.mcd.mot.com!mcdphx!
jaj@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Need mobile tribander advice.
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I have a Kenwood 742 configured with 220, 440, and 1200. I took out the 2 meter band module that originally came with it and sold it. Kenwood does not offer this radio in this configuration (in the U.S., anyway) but it works great! I have had absolutely no problems with this radio in a year and it has a lot of features. My only complaint is the microphone - the DTMF buttons are hard to push.

I also have an older Icom 901 that has also been a great radio. The only problem is that you can only monitor 2 bands at a time, but you can add a lot of band modules. However, the band modules are more expensive than Kenwood's. Icom says they cost more because of the fiber optic interface designed into the band modules. I know that fiber isn't cheap, so I tend to believe them.

A friend of mine who works at a local ham store has been using an Icom Delta-100 for a couple of months now. He really likes it a lot, as well as the Kenwood 742/942 series. His only complaints about the Icom are minor and he has no problem recommending it, either.

If I were buying all over again, I'd still get the Kenwood because I don't want 2 meters. But if I wanted 2 meters over 220 then I'd probably go with the Icom,

but only because I know someone who works there, not because it's superior to the Kenwood.

Hope this helps!

John

--

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| John A. Johnson | N5NHH | \ | "A spare tube & a radio - don't leave |
| Systems Engineer | | \ __o | home without them!" |
| Motorola Computer Group | | _ '\< _ | |
| Dallas, Texas | | (*)/'(*) | jaj@dal.mcd.mot.com |

Date: 12 Mar 1994 18:46:03 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!
news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Wanted: "This Week in Amateur Radio" Info
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I heard a tape of "This Week in Amateur Radio" from the Omega Network. I was wondering if anyone had anymore info on when this is broadcasted, what freqs, etc. I am mainly interested in which freqs I can hear it on here in Los Angeles, California.

--

John "Tremolo" Molson (tremolo@kaiwan.com)
PGP 2.3 Public Key Available Upon Request.

Date: 12 Mar 1994 11:36:26 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
montego!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Wanted: Info on programming Wilson WH6016B
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I have a couple of Wilson model WH-6016B VHF mobile radios that were obtained by aFrom ham-equip-relay@ucsd.edu Sat Mar 12 12:31:59 1994
Received: from network.ucsd.edu by ucsd.edu; id MAA01245
sendmail 8.6.4/UCSD-2.2-sun via ESMTP
Sat, 12 Mar 1994 12:31:58 -0800 for <ham-equip-digest@ucsd.edu>
Received: from localhost by network.ucsd.edu (8.6.4/UCSDGENERIC.4)
id MAA15313 to ham-equip-digest@ucsd.edu; Sat, 12 Mar 1994 12:28:41 -0800
Received: from USENET by network.ucsd.edu with netnews
for ham-equip-digest@ucsd.edu (ham-equip@ucsd.edu);

contact usenet@network.ucsd.edu if you have questions.
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu
Date: Sat, 12 Mar 1994 15:18:08 GMT
Message-ID: <1994Mar12.151808.18080@bongo.tele.com>
Organization: Tired and Weary
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
bongo!julian@network.ucsd.edu
Sender: ham-equip-relay@ucsd.edu
References: , <063311Z12031994@anon.penet.fi>
Subject: Re: lojack detector wanted

In article <063311Z12031994@anon.penet.fi> an19585@anon.penet.fi writes:

>

>

>We have a possible situation with a small stick on transmitter
>on one or more of our vehicles, similar to lojack but this
>we understand is an older model, larger, requiring welding
>etc....we are an environmental group who has also criticized
>police misconduct.

Paranoid ravings deleted.

Why don't you grow a pair of balls and provide some useful
data? Besides a real name and site, a real city and a few other things
might solicit some help. But if you are not willing to give
information, why should anyone give you information?

--

Julian Macassey, N6ARE julian@bongo.tele.com Voice: (310) 659-3366
Paper Mail: Apt 225, 975 Hancock Ave, West Hollywood, California 90069-4074

Date: Sat, 12 Mar 1994 17:13:57 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.cac.psu.edu!psuvm!
lad122@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WANTED Technics 1200
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Looking for a Technics 1200 turntable. Are you getting rid of yours? Please c
ontact me. As a matter of fact I will buy more than one. Does not matter the
year it was bought. Come on vinyl is dying anyway so send me your information
on your used Technics 1200 turntable.

Date: 13 Mar 1994 00:12:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!
palmer@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <CMEnED.G1M@hpcvsnz.cv.hp.com>,
<1994Mar11.185311.15115@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <2ltfkh\$31f@winfree.gag.com>
Subject : Re: GPS Receiver Boards

bdale@gag.com (Bdale Garbee) writes:

>All give good results for position and velocity applications. If you want to
>fly them on weather balloons and such, the Motorola behaves best, holding the
>last valid position when you hit the COCOM restriction height, the Trimble
>resets to their corporate offices in CA, reportedly. I don't know anyone who
>has flown a Rockwell in this application.

Apparently the restriction is only required when you exceed certain
altitude AND speed limit simultaneously. Our group has successfully
used GPS (the Rockwell card, I am ~90% sure) on scientific balloons
(~125,000 feet, but typically much less than a hundred miles per hour).
We were warned that early versions of the board we used would not
work, because it unnecessarily restricted at either a certain altitude
OR speed limit.

Contact the companies for further details.

--

David M. Palmer palmer@alumni.caltech.edu
palmer@tgrs.gsfc.nasa.gov
Clipper: Privacy for people who have nothing to hide.

Date: 12 Mar 1994 22:27:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!gag.com!bdale@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2lh20r\$auf@bigfoot.wustl.edu>, <CMEnED.G1M@hpcvsnz.cv.hp.com>,
<1994Mar11.185311.15115@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>
Subject : Re: GPS Receiver Boards

bonomo@specxn.enet.dec.com wrote:

: I've sent for the specs from Motorola...

: If the product is up to snuff...

I've worked with, or have friends who have worked with, the Rockwell, Trimble,
and Motorola receiver cores. Consensus is that the Motorola core is the best
for time-transfer applications. The Trimble has a well-defined but annoying
jitter to the 1pps signal, the Rockwell gives a 1pps signal that is precise

and fairly stable but not aligned with the edge of a second, complicating host software.

All give good results for position and velocity applications. If you want to fly them on weather balloons and such, the Motorola behaves best, holding the last valid position when you hit the COCOM restriction height, the Trimble resets to their corporate offices in CA, reportedly. I don't know anyone who has flown a Rockwell in this application.

The Rockwell has a GaAs frontend so can work well with non-amplified patch antennas over short coax runs. The Trimble and Motorola units benefit from an amplified patch or better antenna.

In summary, if ya gotta do a group purchase, go with the Mot units, and if the price is good, I know a dozen or so folks (working on the AMSAT P3D GPS project) who are likely to be interested in buying one to play with.

73 - Bdale, N3EUA

End of Ham-Equip Digest V94 #62

